

Applicant's Response

In Applicant's Response dated 06/25/2009, Applicant amended Claims 1-12 and argued against all rejections previously set forth in the Office Action dated 05/08/2009.

In light of Applicant's amendments and remarks, the rejections of Claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Both Claims 1 and 6 first recite an "*electronic device having a display panel and a plurality of keys to which desired functions can be assigned*" (see Lines 1-3) and subsequently recite method steps for assigning the desired functions to the keys (see limitations in the body of the claims). These claims are indefinite because it is unclear whether the claims are for the recited "*electronic device*" or the recited method.

Applicant must amend the claim to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, as required in 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph. Particularly, Applicant must either: 1) amend the claim to recite an “*electronic device*” in the preamble and subsequently recite the components of the “*electronic device*;” or 2) amend the claim to recite a “*method*” in the preamble and subsequently recite the steps of the “*method*.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Takagi et al. (hereinafter Takagi): U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0112248.

Claim 1:

Takagi expressly teaches:

An electronic device having a display panel and a plurality of keys to which desired functions can be assigned, comprising:

displaying a plurality of items on the display panel (fig. 3: displaying multiple items on

the display);

selecting a desired item from the plurality of items (fig. 3: selecting an item from the list of items);

displaying a setting screen corresponding to the selected desired item (fig. 3: displaying a setting menu corresponding to the selected item); and

assigning the selected desired item to one of the plurality of keys using the setting screen, wherein at least one of the plurality of keys is assigned a function for displaying the setting screen (fig. 3; [0035]: assigning the desired item to one of keys as a function for displaying the setting screen); and

wherein said one of the plurality of keys is assigned one of two paired functions (fig. 3: assigning a key to one of two paired functions, such as Beginner Mode "on" and "off", and V Chip "on" and "off").

Claim 2. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein when said one of two paired functions is assigned, a message which prompts a user to assign the other of the two paired functions (figs. 3 & 7).

Claim 3. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein when said one of two paired functions is assigned, the other of the paired functions is automatically assigned to the key (fig. 3).

Claim 4. The electronic device as set forth in claim 1, wherein a sequence of user

performed operations are stored and the stored operations are then assigned to one of the plurality of keys ([0008]-[0014]).

Claim 6. An electronic device having a display panel and a plurality of keys to which desired functions can be assigned, comprising:

displaying a plurality of items on the display panel (fig. 3: displaying multiple items on the display);

selecting a desired item from the plurality of items (fig. 3: selecting a item from the list of items);

displaying a setting screen corresponding to the selected desired (fig. 3: displaying a setting menu corresponding to the selected item); and

assigning the selected desired item to one of the plurality of keys using the setting screen (fig: 3 assigning the selected item to a function key).

displaying a second setting screen for items that are not included in the plurality of items when the selected item is assigned to said one of the plurality of keys (figs. 4A-B: displaying a second setting screen with different items from previous items).

Claims 7-9:

The subject matter recited in Claims 7-9 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claims 2-4, respectively. Thus Takagi, discloses every limitation of Claims 7-9, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 2-4.

Claims 11-12:

The subject matter recited in Claims 11-12 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claims 1 and 6, respectively. Thus Takagi, discloses every limitation of Claims 11-12, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5 and 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takagi in view of Chung et al. (hereinafter Chung): U.S. Patent No. 5,086,503.

Claim 5:

As indicated in the above rejection, Takagi discloses every limitation of claim 1.

Takagi fails to expressly disclose:

functions assigned to two keys of the plurality of keys are swapped.

Chung expressly teaches:

functions assigned to two keys of the plurality of keys are swapped (col. 21 lines 34-36

& 60-62: swapping of the definitions/functions of two selected keys).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system, disclosed in Takagi, to include:

functions assigned to two keys of the plurality of keys are swapped, for the purpose of providing a way of remapping a key within a computer system, as taught in Chung.

Claim 10:

The subject matter recited in Claim 10 corresponds to the subject matter recited in Claim 5. Thus Takagi, in view of Chung, discloses every limitation of Claim 10, as indicated in the above rejections for Claim 5.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments against the rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102 with respect to Claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAEHO D. SONG whose telephone number is (571)272-7524. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on 5712724088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Daeho D Song/
Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175